Published by THE AMERICAN IRON AND STEEL ASSOCIATION *at No. 265 South Fourth Street, Philadelphia, at which place copies of this tract may be had free, for distribution, on application by letter.*

WHAT THE WEST SAYS ABOUT PROTECTION.

DIVERSIFIED WESTERN LABOR.

Extracts from an Address delivered by HON. FRANK W. PALMER, *at the Agricultural Fair, at Morris, Ill., Thursday, Sept. 11, 1873.*

WE have met not exclusively as farmers but as citizens of the county of Grundy—agriculturists, artisans, mechanics, members of all the industrial pursuits which contribute to the security and comfort of life. We have met to give and receive encouragement in the prosecution of honorable toil. This being the purpose of this assemblage, it is not necessary, it would not be fit, that I, coming from a mechanical pursuit, should address you upon theoretical or practical agriculture. There is another and a more appropriate topic, viz.: the relation which agriculture bears to other branches of industry; and of this I propose to speak. I trust no one will apprehend that in presenting this subject I shall transcend the proprieties of this occasion by discussing questions of partisan difference. Partisanship, fortunately or unfortunately for the country, has by systems of imposts long affected the interests and relations of classes of American labor; but there is an inter-state or community relation of industrial branches which, to a degree, is independent of Federal imposts, and to this I shall endeavor to confine myself.

Labor—labor of the hands, labor of the head, honest, progressive, productive labor—is the natural inheritance of man. It is the means placed within his reach to aid and defend him in all the changes, embarrassments, and perils of life. Isolated, it is nothing.

P26300

Associated, it is everything. Fettered, like the galley-slave to one pursuit, it has been servile and impotent. Free, like the aspirations of men, it has been independent and strong, battering down the arbitrary distinctions of caste, obliterating fiefs, manors, and lordly estates in entail, and bringing to nearer equality laity and clergy, serfs and barons, peasants and kings. Time was when labor in cultivation of the soil, or in the thousand arts which minister to the comfort and good of men, was debased; when it cowered submissively before petty chiefs, shut up in lordly castles, and worshiped the victors in war as men fit for the companionship of gods. All this is changed. Legion has borne down legion, chief vanquished chief, victor leveled victor; but the power of associated industry and the arts of peace have been greater levelers than all. Wealth does not consist in money and lands, nor in beneficial titles and possessions. Without labor to till the soil, to penetrate into the caverns of the earth, and to court the winds and breast the billows of the main, all these possessions would be as valueless as the sands of Sahara. Three or four centuries ago the masses began to comprehend this fact. Then began permanent advancement. Agriculture, as the primary pursuit, and commerce and the trades, were strengthened and elevated; industry encouraged intelligence; intelligence pushed liberty, and at last the "toe of the peasant galled the heel of the courtier."

Labor has not since retrograded, but among the several nations stands in various relations. In some it may be regulated by circumstances of climate, or soil, or special governmental control; but in others it is subject to regulation by the laboring classes themselves. In a large majority of the States of the American Union agriculture is the predominant pursuit. Commerce and trade are simply supplementary industries. Federal legislation may influence somewhat the products of these States, but it would not be true to say legislation determines them. Tobacco is the staple of Virginia; rice, of South Carolina; cotton, of Alabama; sugar, of Louisiana. Illinois, Iowa, and Minnesota raise corn and wheat. Climate and soil favor these several branches of husbandry. But they do not limit them, nor does legislation control them. All these States might produce manufactured articles profitably; might fabricate cotton, and wool, and iron, as well as can the States of Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. The people in these several States have voluntarily given direction to their forms of industry, and, when they will, can diminish, or modify, or multiply them.

Labor in the United States being thus under the control of the industrial classes, it is their privilege—ay, their duty—to ascertain the best system under which it may thrive. The history of nations teaches that the limitation of labor to any one department of human industry does not tend to the general good. Whether the pursuit be agriculture, or commerce, or manufactures, the result is the same. Turkey, India, Ireland, Spain, and Portugal are agricultural countries. Their national dependence is everywhere known. Russia grows grain extensively, as do France, England, Belgium, and the States of Northern Germany; but the number of their inhabitants engaged in other branches of industry, except perhaps in Russia, bears nearly an equal proportion to those employed in the cultivation of the soil; and these nations collectively represent the wealth and independence of European powers.

It may be urged that these results are influenced by special laws, and are not, therefore, conclusive effects of an industrial system. It will, then, be well to compare different American States working under the same general laws. Two States, Virginia and Pennsylvania, which are similarly situated relative to climate and extent of sea-coast, may be taken as fair representatives of the two systems of industry. Virginia is an agricultural State; Pennsylvania is an agricultural and manufacturing State. Virginia has 15,352 more square miles of territory than Pennsylvania, and has nearly as extensive mineral deposits as the latter State. Between 1790 and 1800 Virginia increased in population 17.63 per cent., and Pennsylvania 38.67 per cent. In 1810 the increase of Virginia was 10.73 per cent.; that of Pennsylvania 33.49 per cent. In 1820 the increase of Virginia was 9.51 per cent.; that of Pennsylvania 29.55 per cent. In 1830 Virginia showed a gain of 13.17 per cent.; Pennsylvania 28.47 per cent. In 1840 Virginia showed an increase of 2.34 per cent.; Pennsylvania 27.87 per cent. In 1850 Virginia showed a gain of 14.60 per cent.; Pennsylvania 54.29 per cent. In 1860 the increase in Virginia was 12.29 per cent.; Pennsylvania 25.71 per cent. In 1870 the two Virginias, the separation of those States having been accomplished in that decade, showed an increase of 3.52 per cent.; Pennsylvania 20.82 per cent. To what cause other than the diversified industry fostered by the latter State could this rapid increase in its population be attributed? The soil of the State was neither so rich nor her climate so genial as those of the Old Dominion. Virginia schooled its sons for one pursuit—agriculture; Pennsylvania taught the skilled labor of the forge, the loom,

3373
Am34W

and the anvil. In eighteen counties in Virginia the number of inhabitants in 1870 was not so large in each as it was in 1790—eighty-three years ago.

If it be true that the prosperity of cities is indicative of the opulence of States, and it need not be doubted, a comparison between the States already mentioned will show the importance of diversified industry. In 1870 Pennsylvania had seven cities containing over 20,000 inhabitants; Virginia had one. Which State, think you, afforded the readiest market for the products of the farm? In the four counties surrounding Philadelphia the average value of farming lands is $125, $127, $160, and $215 per acre, respectively. In 1860 Virginia had in farms 10,745,244 acres, the value of which was $314,625,226, and the products of which were valued at $85,-754,493. Pennsylvania had 11,515,965 acres of farming lands, worth $1,043,481,582, the products of which were valued at $183,-946,027. This shows that Pennsylvania, with little over 1,000,000 acres of cultivated land more than Virginia, had farm products worth double those of Virginia, while the soil itself was worth the most by nearly $730,000,000.

As a more comprehensive evidence of the benefits to agriculture of diversified industry, Mr. Caird, the highest British authority, in his work entitled "English Agriculture in 1850–1," after carefully exploring thirty English counties, reports that in twelve northern counties, which include the coal region and the seat of mining and manufacturing enterprise, agricultural wages average $2.79 a week, while in eighteen southern counties, whose productive industries are greatly less diversified, agricultural wages are not above $2.04. "The influence of manufacturing enterprise is thus seen," he observes, "to add thirty-seven per cent. to the wages of the agricultural laborers of the northern counties, as compared with those of the south, and the line is distinctly drawn at the point where the coal ceases to be found." In 1771 Benjamin Franklin wrote from London as follows: "Here in England it is well known and understood that whenever a manufactory is established which employs a number of hands it raises the value of lands in the neighboring country all around it, partly by the greater demand near at hand for the produce of the land and partly by the plenty of money drawn by the manufactures to that part of the country. It seems, therefore, the interest of all our farmers and landowners to encourage our young manufacturers."

Illinois, with its unparalleled richness of soil and its illimitable

deposits of coal, and iron; its water communication with the Atlantic seaboard, either by the Gulf of Mexico or the Gulf of St. Lawrence; and its unequaled railway lines stretching to the shores of either ocean, has already profited largely by the diversification of its productive industries; but in almost every county there is room for enlargement and encouragement of the system. What is true of Illinois in this respect is also true of all the States in the Northwest. We can not afford to be dependent on the production of corn and wheat alone, and the exportation of them to a foreign or even a distant market, when, by the establishment of manufacturing industries among us, we can furnish a far better market at home. The West will never have universal, durable prosperity until it shall have what New England, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania have, viz.: diversified productive industry.

In the very constitution of man varied employments are necessities. Men are not all of one type; their bodies and minds of one capacity; their actions ruled by one law. What lights the imagination of one falls insensibly on another. Contiguity of varied industries begets incalculable benefits. A few months ago the superintending physician of one of the largest insane asylums in the United States was asked, in my presence, from what class the largest percentage of his patients came. From what class would you say? Lawyers, doctors, preachers, or editors? From neither! The answer was that farmers furnish the largest class, and for the reason that their occupation is ordinarily an isolated one, and, as a large share of the grievances and sorrows of this life are mere fancies, the illusions are nursed and brooded over in the loneliness of the field and the seclusion of the fireside, and not dissipated by contact with other classes, as among men in other pursuits. So it may be safely assumed that the physical and mental as well as the financial interests of men are promoted by the contiguity and intimate association of various industrial classes.

Farmers of Grundy county, you may take your own experience as an illustration of the policy I am endeavoring to advocate. Some of you came here before the advent of railways or even canals. To profit by the advantages of cheap lands, under the protection of free and equal laws, and to establish homes for your wives and your children, you came here and encountered the hardships, privations, and suffering of pioneer tillers of the soil. Compelled to haul your corn or your wheat by wagon loads to Chicago, what was the net return for all your labor? As the tide of immigration approached

nearer and nearer to you, for what class of neighbors and helpers did you look most eagerly? Did you look for farmers like yourselves, who would aid in swelling the amount of surplus agricultural crops, or did you look, rather, for the advent of blacksmiths, carpenters, shoemakers, manufacturers, merchants, printers, schoolteachers, artists—men who would be consumers of the products of the farm, and help to bring to you a market at your own doors? What a limited diversification of labor has already accomplished for you, a generous system of manufactures might accomplish almost unlimitedly. Your farms are underlaid with coal; you have an abundance of good water; you can have skilled labor without stint; and your facilities for transportation are good. Why should your prosperity be circumscribed?

WITHIN the last quarter of a century there have grown up throughout the Great West a long line of industries of such magnitude that they are now boldly competing with the same class of industries that in Great Britain have a growth of two or three centuries. These include nearly the whole range of mechanical industries, with the exception of textile manufactures. Among these are not only the rougher grades of machinery, like saw mills, flouring mills, iron mills, nail mills, and rail mills, steam engines, (stationary, locomotive and marine,) rails and rolling stock, bridges, etc., agricultural implements of every description, heavy and light wagons and carriages, but the finer and more elaborate kind of manufactures, such as watches, jewelry, scientific instruments, silver-plated ware, cutlery, edged tools, hardware, etc., etc.—*Chicago Western Manufacturer.*

PROTECTING HOME INDUSTRY.—The *Appeal*, of West Point, Iowa, stands up for home industries, as the following bears witness: "Charity begins at home, and self-preservation is the duty, not only of individuals, but of communities. Public enterprise is the lever that has made the civilized nations of the world what they are to-day; and the lack of public enterprise has made other nations a blot upon the surface of the earth, a clog on the wheels of progress, a drag on the march of improvement. But we are not particularly exercised over the manifestation of public spirit in other parts of the world. Our interest begins here at home."

MACHINE-MADE doors, window frames, and sashes of Western manufacture are becoming a large article of export.

PROTECTION AND AGRICULTURE.

From The Indianapolis Journal.

NOTHING in the moral world is more certain than that the prosperity and welfare of the country demand a policy of judicious Protection. It is the habit of some to dismiss the consideration of this subject with the remark that it concerns only the manufacturing interest, and consequently is interesting only to a class. There could be no greater mistake than this. It concerns all interests, the development of the whole country, and the prosperity of every individual. If Protection is the true policy, as reason, experience, and facts prove it to be, the farmers of Indiana and the West are as much interested in its establishment as are the manufacturers of New England and the East. For it stands to reason that the development of manufactures means the creation of a home market for the products of the soil, with diversified industry and general prosperity. The development of manufactures not only creates a new demand for labor in that field, thus inuring to the benefit of the laboring man, but adds to the class of consumers and creates an increased demand for the products of the soil, thus contributing directly to the prosperity of the farmer. That this was the view of the fathers of the Government is very clear. Hamilton was the father of the Protective policy. Washington and Jefferson, the first two Presidents, were both farmers, and both repeatedly urged in their messages a governmental policy to promote manufactures. It is not to be supposed that they did this to develop one class at the expense of others, or to build up manufactures at the expense of agriculture. They did it because they knew the development of manufactures meant the development of agriculture by the creation of home markets and increased demand for agricultural products. The direct benefit to agriculture of the development of manufactures will appear from a few considerations:

First, suppose the case of a farmer without any market at all for his surplus products. Suppose him to be located in the midst of an extensive plain or valley, fertile and productive, but inaccessible and so completely cut off from the rest of the world that he would have no market at all. Not only would the results of his toil be greatly lessened by the impossibility of procuring labor-saving machinery and implements, but all that he produced over and above the wants of himself and family would be sheer waste. It would be dead loss for the lack of a market. The condition of such a farmer would be most deplorable. Second, suppose that instead of

no market at all he had a very distant market, say a manufacturing city or town a hundred miles distant, and accessible only by country road. This would be an improvement on the former situation, but still very far from a happy condition. The remoteness of the market and the difficulty of reaching it would prevent him from availing himself of it with any regularity, and would practically compel him to accept whatever might be offered him for his products. If other farmers were situated near the market he would be completely at their mercy in every respect. He could market but very few articles, and would have to take the buyers' price for what he did market. But, third, suppose a manufacturing town to spring up within a few miles of the farmer's house, and the means of communication were such as to enable him to market his products every day or whenever it suited him. Now, he not only has a steady and reliable market for all he can produce, at good prices, but he is encouraged to engage in branches of agriculture untried before, and to produce articles which he had never dreamed there was any demand for or any profit in. By the cheapening of many things which he needed, and which are now produced almost at his door, his labor is rendered more easy and productive, while the surplus produce which before was accustomed to decay on his hands now finds steady and profitable sale.

The foregoing simple illustration, if applied on a large scale, will show the effect of developing manufactures on agriculture. To state the case in a nutshell, *Protection creates a home market for home products.* It tends to shorten the distance between the farmer and the manufacturer, the producer and the consumer, thus diminishing to both the cost of exchanging their respective products, and securing to the farmer not only surer and steadier markets for his produce but a better recompense for his labor. If the farmers of Indiana will only think about this matter they can not fail to see where their true interest lies, and to see, also, the suicidal folly of a policy which would destroy their home markets.

When the United States were colonial dependencies of Great Britain she governed us by bad laws; now that we are politically independent she seeks to govern us by bad logic. She urges upon us the adoption of a Free Trade policy, not because she believes it will be beneficial to us but because she knows it will be highly advantageous to her. Not until she had developed and diversified her industries to a marvelous degree by centuries of the most strin-

gent Protection the world ever saw; not until she excelled all other countries in the quantity, variety, and excellence of her labor-saving machinery; not until she had so organized resources, multiplied skill, and accumulated wealth as to be able to bid defiance to all foreign competition, did she begin to open her ports as an invitation to other nations to do the same. Even then her supreme object was to kick down the ladder by which she had mounted to the heights she occupied, so that no other people could follow after her.—*Chicago Commercial Advertiser.*

WESTERN FARMERS FIFTY-FIVE YEARS AGO.

From The Chicago Inter-Ocean.

Soon after the panic of 1873 the pressure of unprofitable prices descended with increasing severity upon our manufacturers, accompanied by a diminishing demand for their products. Meanwhile the values of breadstuffs and provisions were sustained to a remarkable degree, to which was added a continuous demand in foreign countries, augmented to quantities never before equaled in the history of our exportations. The exchangeable value of wheat, of corn, of cattle, and of hogs, as measured against the value of manufactured articles, was largely enhanced by the shrinking prices of the latter. It became notorious that Western farmers constituted the most prosperous portion of our people, they least of all our classes having been touched by the almost universal and calamitous depression which quickly followed the financial revulsion. Not until last year did the embarrassment of unremunerative prices reach the agricultural community. But, however unsatisfactory and unrewarding may have been the prices of farm produce since the close of last year, the condition does not begin to compare with the deplorable severity which existed throughout the West some fifty-five years ago. Mr. Ewing, of Ohio, in a speech delivered in the United States Senate in February, 1832, made the graphic statement given below:

In short, every portion of the world was searched by our intelligent merchants, and all combined did not furnish a market adequate to our surplus productions. Every farmer in Ohio long knew and felt the pressure consequent upon this state of things. Year after year their stacks of wheat stood unthreshed, scarcely worth the manual labor of separating the grain from the straw; so low was it reduced, in comparison with manufactured articles, that *I have known forty bushels of wheat given for a pair of boots;* such was the state of things in the Western country prior to, and at the time of, the revision of the tariff in 1824.

Our farmers are very far above such an abyss of depression as that. The privations of those days of ruinous cheapness are in no danger of repetition now. Since then comparative comfort has entered the homes of those who cultivate the soil, and it has come to remain. If prices for agricultural produce are unprofitably low, there is a steady market for the surplus, and there is a strong promise of continued vastness in the foreign demand. Assuredly the farmers in 1824 were very much worse off than the farmers are in 1879. The latter enjoy a paradise of privileges and blessings, as contrasted with the disadvantages and hardships of the former.

In another part of his speech Senator Ewing said:

> Our manufactures were annihilated; our home market was thus cut off; the foreign ports were, in effect, closed against us; the market which our armies had afforded the Western farmer during the war had ceased; that army disbanded; the soldiers became farmers, and added their quota to the vast amount of our surplus agricultural products; the only market that remained open to us was a small portion of the Eastern and Southern States, the West India Islands, and, to a limited extent, the coast of South America; consequently, our produce was freighted upon the waters, and sent downward to New Orleans, but the supply exceeded the demand twice told; the market was glutted; the price went down almost to nothing; and many a mercantile enterprise there has involved even more than a total loss. I well recollect an instance in which, after the sale of boat and cargo, and placing the proceeds to the credit of the freighter, the balance against him, as claimed by the commission merchant, was something more than $400. This, however, was an extreme case; but, generally, from about the year 1821 to 1825 the export trade was ruinous to all who engaged in it. The truth is no foreign market whatever, beyond the very narrow limits which I have specified, did exist.

How different the situation to-day, with all its ground for complaint! If, as then, nearly the whole of our surplus products should be deprived of an outlet to foreign countries, and should remain a glutting weight upon our domestic markets, crushing prices down to the very minimum, the case would be infinitely worse than it is. Perhaps no other comparison could more vividly illustrate the prodigious improvement which has taken place in the character and position of American agriculture during the last half century. It has a vital force, an elasticity, a diversification, and a world-wide influence not dreamed of in the days of 1824. The overwhelming vicissitudes of the olden times are scarcely to be feared when the mechanic arts have been brought to such a high degree of development, and locomotives, with their trains of cars, have become our beasts of burden.

TARIFF PROTECTION IN THE LIGHT OF EXPERIENCE.

From The Chicago Commercial Advertiser.

THE most convincing proof in favor of the Protective policy is that all the prosperous periods enjoyed by this country have been when the duties on imports have been high. The most conclusive argument against the Free Trade policy is that low duties have always been followed by the disorganization of our industry and the pressure of hard times. More than that, our tariff history is the history of a see-saw of experiments with hostile systems, in which Protection succeeded partial Free Trade, and partial Free Trade supplanted Protection. Until the series of tariffs which began in 1861 we had tried only two periods of Protection—one of nine years, and another of four. In both of these cases partial Free Trade had so completely broken down industry and commerce that a resort to Protection was rendered compulsory; and, in both cases, our business interests were rescued from paralysis, imbued with robust life, and raised into conspicuous prosperity.

Our first tariff worthy of the name of Protection was that of 1824. For a number of years previous to that date the condition of the whole country was deplorable. The American markets were flooded with foreign merchandise. Home manufacturers were everywhere overmastered by ruinous competition from abroad. Employment was scarce and wages ridiculously low. An embarrassed condition was the common lot. Gloom and despondency filled the public countenance. Enterprise was dead. So soon as the tariff of 1824 went into operation the whole aspect and course of affairs were changed. Activity took the place of sluggishness. Capital sought investments. Labor came into demand. Wages advanced. Mines were opened, furnaces built, mills started, shops multiplied. Business revived in all its departments. Revenue flowed copiously into the coffers of the Government. The debts created by two expensive wars were entirely paid off. Such a scene of general prosperity had never before been seen by our people. More stringent Protection was provided by the act of 1828, and affairs still more rapidly improved. President Jackson said, in his annual message, December 4, 1832: "Our country presents on every side marks of prosperity and happiness, unequaled, perhaps, in any other portion of the world."

Then came the nullification times of South Carolina and the compromise tariff of 1833. This act took effect January 1, 1834,

and was to operate by a series of periodical reductions of the rates on imports until June 30, 1842, after which date no duty was to exceed twenty per cent. Under this legislation industry and trade soon declined. Foreign goods poured like an inundation into our markets. Embarrassment took the place of thrift. Less than three and a half years brought the panic and the collapse of 1837. Affairs went from bad to worse. The Government became impoverished with the people. Its resources sank so low that President Tyler could not at one time obtain the payment of his salary, and had to resort to the brokers for loans. The credit of the United States was so damaged that a loan for so small a sum as twelve million dollars could not be negotiated at home nor abroad, and the President bewailed this fact in his annual message to Congress, December 7, 1842.

Alleviation was sought and obtained by the Protective tariff of 1842, the best measure of the kind we have had in all our history. The effect was almost magical. Recuperation began at once, and was accelerated with the progress of time. A most extraordinary revival of production and trade was speedily accomplished. We may sum up the results in the words of President Polk's annual message, December 8, 1846, as follows: "Labor in all its branches is receiving an ample reward, while education, science, and the arts are rapidly enlarging the means of social happiness. The progress of our country in her career of greatness, not only in the vast extension of our territorial limits, and in the rapid increase of our population, but in resources and wealth, and in the happy condition of our people, is without an example in the history of nations."

When these glowing words were published the Free Trade tariff of 1846 had been in operation just eight days. Again the country took the downward way. Although the movement was slower than from 1833, the decadence went on steadily. Our Presidents ceased to congratulate the country on its prosperity. Yet a further reduction of the tariff took place in 1857, followed, in a few months, by the panic of that year. Revenue declined. Wages went down. Employment at any pay was hard to find. Just before the Rebellion the Government was borrowing money to pay its ordinary expenses in time of peace.

In 1861 was passed that Protective tariff which the Free Traders denounced as "the bill of abominations." Under that and the following acts we once more had a marvelous recuperation of production and commerce. For about eighteen years we have been living

under that system. It has given to the country a diversification of employment and development of resources without a parallel in our history. The panic of 1873 is the only financial revulsion we have had in a Protective period, and from the effects of that we are recovering with Protection in full force. Production in many branches of the mechanic arts is so far above our own wants that we are beginning to look *abroad* for new markets. Our manufacturers have so largely secured the home demand that the balance of trade has turned immensely, and it is thought permanently, in our favor.

Such are the fruits of Protection to native industry. The teachings of experience are worth far more than the enticing yet fallacious plausibilities of so-called political economy. We have abundantly the tests of experiments to guide us in forming our judgment of the respective merits of Tariff Protection and Free Trade. Those tests indicate it to be the part of wisdom to adhere unflinchingly to our present policy of duties on imports.

TREATIES OF COMMERCE.

From The Chicago Inter-Ocean.

A RECENT cable dispatch makes the following announcement:

A delegation from the French committee to promote the Franco-American Treaty of Commerce waited on M. Tierard, the Minister of Commerce, and called his attention to Fernando Wood's motion in the United States House of Representatives, relative to commercial relations. Tierard received the delegation very cordially. He stated that he was in favor of a reciprocity treaty, and his Department would give the matter the most serious consideration.

We do not perceive where the power on the part of our Government is to be found to negotiate the sort of commercial treaty which is contemplated. Under the constitution, authority to make treaties is lodged exclusively in the hands of the President and of the Senate, acting concurrently; but no participating power, either to initiate, or to promote, or to modify, or to negative, has been conferred upon the House of Representatives. On the other hand, the constitution provides that "*all bills* for raising revenue shall *originate* in the *House of Representatives;* but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills." From the foundation of the Government it has been recognized as a principle of our legislation that every measure which would have the effect of increasing, or diminishing, or regulating the revenue must be initiated

in the popular branch of Congress. With reference to treaties and to revenue acts, the division of power between the Senate and the House is clear, definite, positive, and permanent. It is unconstitutional for either branch to cross the threshold of the power granted to the other. Each of the two bodies has its peculiar functions to exercise and its separate duties to perform. The House would become less than the constitution designed it to be if the Senate should invade or subvert its sole authority to originate bills to raise revenue.

Now, this proposed treaty of commerce between France and the United States is open to this very objection of encroachment upon the constitutional prerogative of the House. It is proposed to fix by treaty the duties on a considerable number of articles imported into this country from France, so as to grant special rates in exchange for concessions made from the French general tariff, to suit the wishes or to promote the interests of those of our citizens who are engaged in exporting merchandise to France. Such an arrangement would take away, for the time stipulated in the text of the treaty, the power of the House of Representatives to either increase or diminish the specified duties, so far as the treaty-country was concerned. No matter what might be the exigencies of our Government, nor how urgent the need for additional revenue, the commerce of France with the United States could not be made to contribute anything further to our national income, by advancing the duties on imports. If it should be deemed advisable by Congress, as it was during the War of 1812, to double the tariff on *all* articles, the imports from France would have to be excepted from the sweeping provision. Whenever the changed circumstances of this country should render necessary a new adjustment of our tariff, our commercial relations with France could not be brought within the scope of the new regulations. So much of the revenue derived by our Government from duties on imports as came or could come from imports from France would be irrevocably fixed by the action of the President and the Senate, in the shape of a treaty; and, to that extent, the authority over the revenue given exclusively to the House by the constitution would be subverted, and transferred to the treaty-making power, where its existence and exercise would be a usurpation and a misapplied function. It never could have been intended by the organic law that a power given to one branch of Congress in express terms, and to that one alone, should be enjoyed also by another department of the Government. Nor is the force

of this reasoning diminished by the fact that the prerogative conferred upon the House of Representatives relates to "*bills* for raising revenue." It is only through the medium of "bills" that, under our political system, any proposition for raising revenue can take a practical shape. Treaties have not been employed for that purpose, and were not designed by the framers of the constitution to fulfill that office; otherwise, the sphere and object of treaties would have been more clearly defined, or else the exclusive control over revenue measures given to the House would have been modified by an exceptional reference to treaties. All enactments, including treaties, made in pursuance of the constitution are declared to be the supreme *law* of the land; consequently, a constitutional *treaty* is no less a *law* than a constitutional *bill* passed into a *law*. A treaty law, however, *originates* with the Executive Department, and receives its binding force from the concurrence of the President and the Senate, co-operating with some foreign government, while a revenue law *originates*, in the shape of a bill, wholly and exclusively within the body called the House of Representatives—the body which most nearly affiliates with the principle that taxation and representation go together, and receives its binding force from the concurrence of the House, the Senate, and the President, or from the concurrence of two-thirds of each branch of Congress overriding an Executive veto, and without the participation or intervention, at any stage of the legislation, of any foreign government whatever. How is it possible, then, to do by a *treaty* law what is specifically reserved to a *revenue* law, without violating an express stipulation of the *organic* law, and making usurpation the measure of authority? A wise dread of "entangling alliances"—of "European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice"—was upon those sagacious men who formed our Union; and a considerable part of Washington's farewell address is devoted to warnings of which the following sentence is an example: "Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence I conjure you to believe me, fellow-citizens, the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government." It is not supposable that patriots who held to such views designed in the constitution to make *any* treaty, necessarily involving the concurrence of a foreign country, an appropriate or an available medium through which to fix duties on imports, and thereby determine how much or how little revenue should be raised from our commerce with some favored nation.

Another insuperable objection to the proposed treaty is the constitutional provision that "all duties, imposts and excises shall be *uniform* throughout the United States." Would there be uniformity if one set of duties should be levied on imports from France, and a totally different set on imports from all other countries? Would duties be uniform when French silks could be entered at our custom houses at a lower rate than German or English silks? The constitutional provision seems to signify that there shall be, in fixing duties, no favoritism, not merely of one State of the Union over another State, but also of one nation over another nation. There appears to be no escape from this interpretation, when we reflect that, at the time of framing the constitution, a belief was universal among the people that the surest way to avoid foreign complications, and to secure immunity from external annoyance, was to adopt an *impartial* foreign policy. "Equal rights for all, exclusive privileges to none," was the motto of those days, and should be of these.

But, aside from the constitutional question, there is an invincible obstacle of a practical nature. We have a number of treaties with various nations containing what is technically known as the "favored-nation-clause," which is a stipulation that every privilege of commerce which is allowed by us to any one country shall also be enjoyed by the other countries with which we have these treaties. As regards ourselves, such an engagement is both consistent with the provisions of our constitution and harmless to our interests, because our tariff is of a general character, affecting all countries alike, leaving us perfectly free to abolish or to vary the duties as experience and circumstances may require; but, if we should inaugurate a conventional tariff with France, allotting to her special privileges and advantages of import into the United States, those countries to which we are bound by the "favored-nation-clause" could and might justly demand equal participation in such privileges and advantages. The proposed Franco-American treaty of commerce might, therefore, in practical effect, amount to a general revision of our customs laws of the most unfortunate kind, since we would thereby lose, to the extent of the change effectuated, all power to rectify, alter, amend, or modify, *by legislation*, so long as the treaty with France should continue obligatory upon our Government, or until the expiration of the treaties which contained the "favored-nation-clause." Under such conditions the encroachment of the treaty-making power upon the constitutional prerogative of the House of Representatives to "*originate*" *all* measures affecting

the revenue would be radical and sweeping indeed. Surely, in defining the treaty-making power, the framers of the constitution can not reasonably be supposed to have designed to create such a confusion of functions, and such a clash between agencies. It would be not only illogical but even rashly puerile to assume the existence of any such intent. From whatever point of view we regard the proposed treaty, it appears to be a project violative of the express provisions of our organic law, and hence unworthy to be entertained, as well as impracticable in its nature.

There is a paragraph in Washington's farewell address, so felicitously suited to the subject in hand, that we can not refrain from quoting it now and here:

> Harmony and a liberal intercourse with all nations are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the stream of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with Powers so disposed (in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, to enable the Government to support them,) conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and natural opinion will permit, but temporary and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another—that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character—that by such acceptance it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not having given more. There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

These are the parting counsels of one of the most noble minds and patriotic hearts connected with our history. Washington's farewell address stands as a revered landmark in our politics. Two generations of eminent American statesmen were fond of quoting from its appropriate and wise warnings. These never were more pertinent or more needed than now. The voice of the Father of his Country calls from his grave to posterity to beware of such commercial treaties as show partiality to one nation over others, and hence to beware of the proposed treaty of commerce with France, which would be a treaty of that very kind.

Our favorable balance of trade is mainly due to the policy which has built up domestic instead of foreign manufactures.

OTHER TRIBUTES TO THE EXCELLENCE OF THE PROTECTIVE POLICY.

THE DUTY NOT ADDED TO THE PRICE.

SAYS one of the newspaper advocates of a tariff for revenue only: "It is one of the beauties of the Protective system that it raises the prices of all the articles produced in the country up to at least the price of the imported article *plus* the amount of the duty." This is not true.

Many years ago, when Congress had imposed a duty of eight cents per square yard upon coarse cotton cloth, the same grade and quality of the domestic fabric were selling in the American market at six cents per square yard.

In 1844 and 1846, in the debates in Congress on the tariff question, it was shown that, though the duty on glass was $4.00 a box, glass was actually selling at $3.50 a box; that the duty on nails was three and one-half cents a pound, while nails were selling for three and a quarter cents a pound; that the duty on cotton cloth was seven cents a yard, and cotton cloth was then freely sold for six cents a yard.

When Congress, in 1870, reduced the duty on pig iron from $9 to $7 per ton, British manufacturers immediately held a conference and voted to put the sum of $2 per ton into their own pockets by increasing their prices by just so much.

In 1872, when Congress reduced the duty on salt in packages to just half of what it had been, and on salt in bulk to less than half, the price at once went up in the country from which the major part of our importations usually came. A correspondent of *The Inter-Ocean*, who showed a remarkable familiarity with the salt question, wrote to that paper in December, 1877, as follows: "A few years since Congress did reduce the tariff on salt more than half, but the very same day that the new tariff went into effect British salt dealers advanced their prices *fifteen* cents per bushel, and the consumer in America got no benefit from the reduction."

The duty on chloroform is to-day $1 per pound, and American-made chloroform is quoted at eighty-five cents per pound in the Chicago market.

Said Senator Davis, of Illinois, when the question of reducing the duty on quinine was pending in the Senate: "If this Congress does nothing else than repeal the duty on quinine, it will not have been in vain that it was called together." The rise in the price of this medicine shows that Senator Davis was not a wise prophet. The English manufacturers advanced the price of quinine about 37½ cents an ounce the next day after the repeal of the duty in the United States became telegraphically known in Europe, and in New York the price at once advanced from $3.40 to $3.50 an ounce. The price still tends upward. The result of the action of Congress in repealing the duty shows that the duty had not enhanced the price. Were the Free Trade theory correct, the repeal or the reduction of any tariff duty should be followed by an equivalent decline in the prices of both the foreign and the home-made article in our market.

Under the late Canadian tariff the duty on printing type was five per cent. The new tariff, going into force on March 15, 1879, increased the duty to 20 per cent. Thereupon the importing agents of a firm of British manufacturers advertised in the Dominion newspapers in these words: "The new tariff will cause us considerable loss, and impose fresh outlay upon us; nevertheless, we have determined to sell our celebrated extra hard metal Scotch type at our *old prices*." Under the operations of the new tariff the price of printing ink has been reduced in Canada. The St. John *Sun* says: "Our printing office bought Canadian-made printing ink of a superior quality yesterday at a cent per lb. less than the same quality of United States ink is offered. That is to say, the Canadian ink cost us $8 per 100 lbs., with freight from Montreal added. The United States ink costs $9 per 100 lbs., with freight from Boston, and 20 per cent. duty added. Before the tariff, United States ink such as we use cost $9 and freight charges; and, as freight charges are about the same from Montreal as from Boston, it is plain that we save $1 per 100 lbs. under the new tariff. There are now two ink factories in Canada. The new duty has led to home competition."

Under the Mackenzie-Cartwright tariff, in Canada, there was a duty of eleven cents a gallon on imported vinegar, and yet home-made vinegar sold as low as twelve cents per gallon.

If there were any force whatever in the theory that the duty is added to the price, then are the farmers of this country also monopolists. There are several millions of these farmers. Our Govern-

ment levies duties on all foreign products which compete with the products of American farms. If these duties are added to the price of the domestic products, then are we indeed a fearfully taxed people, for we consume more agricultural products than all other products combined. We will let Judge Kelley answer such nonsense. In his speech in May, 1878, in reply to Hon. Fernando Wood, he gave the following statement of the quantity of wheat, barley, potatoes, corn, oats, and rye raised in this country in 1877, the quantity exported, the quantity retained for home consumption, the rate of duty on each, and the consequent tax imposed on the people of the country at large by the farmers if it be true that duties are added to the price not only of imported articles but also to those of domestic production.

PRODUCTS.	No. of bushels raised in 1877.	No. of bushels exported.	Balance for home consumption.	Duty per bushel.	Amount of tax imposed on the consumers in the United States, calculated in accordance with the Free Trade dogma that the duty is added to the price.
Wheat.....	360,000,000	57,043,936	302,956,064	$0 20	$60,591,212 80
Barley.....	35,600,000	1,186,129	34,413,871	15	5,162,080 65
Potatoes.....	146,000,000	529,650	145,470,350	15	21,820,552 50
Corn.....	1,340,000,000	73,100,518	1,266,899,482	10	126,689,948 20
Oats.....	405,000,000	2,854,128	402,145,872	10	40,214,587 20
Rye.....	22,100,000	2,227,000	19,873,000	10	1,987,300 00
Total.....	2,308,700,000	136,941,361	2,171,758,639	.....	$256,465,681 35

If we take into consideration the other protected agricultural productions of this country, it would appear by the Free Traders' assumption that the farmers assessed us with not less than $600,000,000 of taxes in the year 1877. But who believes that they did?

It is one of the beneficent effects of the Protective policy that it stimulates competition in the production of manufactured products, which competition reduces prices invariably. Without the Protection afforded by high duties, many of our leading industries would never have had an existence—the manufacture of steel rails, for instance, while others would have had only a sickly existence. Protective duties reduce prices because they oppose domestic competition to foreign monopoly in the production of manufactured goods.

THE CONSOLATIONS OF THE PROTECTED FARMER.

From The Toronto (Canada) Mail.

THE Yankee farmer rises in the morning tolerably refreshed. True, he has been sleeping on a bed, the sheets, blankets, and mattress of which would have been taxed from 60 to 180 per cent. had they been imported from a foreign country. But they are home-made, and his dreams have not been disturbed by the Free Trade bugbear that "Protection raises the price of the home manufactured article up to at least the price of the imported article *plus* the import duty." Mr. David A. Wells and other agents of the Leeds and Manchester manufacturers once tried to frighten him with this bogy; but experience has taught him that it is only a make-believe. There is an import duty of 8 cents a yard on cotton sheeting, but he buys it from the cotton factory in his market town at 7 cents a yard, and sees enormous quantities of it going to England in competition with Free Trade cotton, to Canada, to South America, and even to Australia. Moreover, he knows that it is to that import duty he owes the establishment of the neighboring cotton factory, whose operatives consume his produce, and give him a profitable home market for rotation crops. The same is true of his blankets and mattress; indeed he is well satisfied with his bed. It is home-made; it cost him if anything less than an imported article; and its manufacture has given employment to artisans who buy the products of his farm almost direct from his wagon.

He proceeds to put on his clothes, nothing alarmed because there is a heavy import duty on foreign tweed cloths, felt hats, boots, and cotton shirts. His suit from head to foot is of American make; the profits of its manufacture have gone to enrich the American people, and he thinks this is better for him than if his tweed coat had come from the West of England, his hat from Nottingham, his shirt from Manchester, and his boots from Stockport. The clock tells him it is breakfast time. He has no hard feelings against the clock merely because foreign clocks are taxed 35 per cent.; on the contrary it reminds him of the clock factories of Connecticut and the thousands of hands to whom they give employment, and who in their turn give a market and an increased value to every adjacent farm.

Breakfast over—by the way, American importers bring his tea direct from China, not *via* Montreal or London—he takes to his farm implements. Foreign implements such as spades, shovels, hoes, forks, rakes, etc., are taxed 35 per cent.; wooden pails, tubs, churns, etc., 35 per cent.; and plows, harrows, seed-sowers, cultivators, mowers,

reapers, threshing machines, etc., 35 per cent.; and in 1860, when the battle of the Morrill tariff was being fought in Congress, the agents of the great Bedford and Leicester firms predicted that an import duty on their goods would ruin farming in the United States. He has discovered, however, that this is not true. Home factories have sprung up everywhere, and the keen competition has not only kept down prices but incited the inventive genius of the American mechanic, so that Yankee farm implements have become the cheapest and the best in the world. The heavy and cumbrous English machines are being driven from foreign markets, and even from the English market itself, which McCormick, of Chicago, has invaded with great success. In fact, when our farmer contemplates the amazing growth and proportions of this industry, it occurs to him that the English agents, who lobbied and even bribed politicians and newspapers to oppose the high tariff, were not actuated so much by regard for the condition of the Yankee farmer as by the consciousness that Protection would deprive them of the American market, and by the fear that it would in the long run make the Yankee manufacturer a formidable rival in other markets.

This is what the farmer thinks as he works in his fields and about his barnyard during the forenoon. He is startled out of this reverie by the toot of the dinner horn; and sits down at the table nothing put out by the reflection that tin horns of foreign make are taxed about two cents each. Neither does he lose his appetite when he remembers that furniture, such as the chair he is sitting on, the table at which he is eating, and the dresser where the dishes are stored, is taxed 35 per cent. when of foreign make. This duty has helped to establish hundreds of furniture factories and to give employment to tens of thousands of mechanics throughout the Union, and in this way has benefited him; for the home manufacturer is everywhere the farmer's best friend.

After dinner he sets out for the market town, and as he journeys thither he pities the Canadian farmer, who, as a rule, has to dispose of his produce to the middlemen that stand like a row of tax gatherers, each levying his tithe, between the Kanuck farm and the foreign consumer. He wonders, too, does this old Yankee farmer, how the Canadian farms endure wheat and barley year after year, and rejoices that Protection has given him a home market to which he can supply almost every variety of crop. He is following this train of thought when he enters the market town at one o'clock; and his sympathy for the Canadian farmer is deepened as he sees troops of

Canadian operatives returning to the factories from their dinner.

"I wonder," he communes, "if the Kanuck farmer ever sees a crowd of Yankee operatives going to work in a Canadian factory? Guess not. Then what do Free Traders mean by arguing that Protection, such as we Yankees are cursed with, ruins industry, while Free Trade, with which the Kanucks have long been blessed, builds it up and makes a nation great? If that were so would not these active little French-Canadians be at work in Montreal, and would not our Yankee mechanics be pouring over there also? How is it, ye Free Trade theorists, that the census of 1870 showed that Canada with four millions of people had sent us nearly half a million, or one in eight, of her children? And how is it that the Canadian census of 1870 showed that we, with ten times four millions, had sent Canada only 70,000 Yankees?"

By this time he has reached the store, and soon disposes of his wheat, tomatoes, carrots, potatoes, etc. With the money received in payment he makes his little purchases, and finds no small consolation in knowing that almost every dollar he pays out goes to home industries. Outsiders get nothing except for raw articles the United States can not produce, such as tea and coffee. "Even if I have to pay a little more for some of my purchases," he says to himself, "it is satisfactory to know the money will be kept in the country, and paid out again for the produce I grow, and the beef, mutton, and pork I raise."

He thinks this over as he travels homeward, and talks Protection *vs.* Free Trade with his sons in the evening. One of them works on the farm, and the others are at trades in the town—Canada has had no attractions for them. "You boys are all here," says the old man, "and I guess that is pretty good evidence that this is a habitable country, Protection and all. If you had gone to Canada or England, and settled there, and were writing over for your friends and acquaintances to join you, as the half million Canadians and the hundreds of thousands of Englishmen in the States do, I should be inclined to suspect something was wrong. But here we are, drawing thousands of immigrants every year from Free Trade countries, while retaining our own folks at home; paying off our war debt rapidly, and getting our bonds into our own hands; exporting $300,000,000 a year more than we import; developing our home industries, pushing our foreign trade, and going ahead like thunder, in spite of panics and bad politics—boys, I guess we've every reason to thank God."

WAGES AND THE COST OF LIVING.—The annual report of the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor contains an important report upon the comparative cost of living and comparative wages of 1860 and 1878. The returns for 63,515 employés show that average weekly wages, on a gold basis, were twenty-four and four-tenths per cent. higher in 1878 than they were in 1860.

Groceries have advanced in price 7 per cent.; provisions, 28; fuel, 5; dry goods have fallen 9 per cent.; boots have advanced 18 per cent.; rents, 25; board, 49. On all these items of expense entering into the cost of living the average price was fourteen and a half per cent. higher in 1878 than it was in 1860.

In other words, the average weekly wages of workingmen in manufacturing and mechanical industries in Massachusetts, allowing for the advance in the cost of living, were ten per cent. higher in 1878 than they were in 1860, no account being made of the fact that the wages in 1878 were paid for fewer hours of labor per week, in many industries, than were required in 1860.—*Boston Commercial Bulletin.*

THE TRUTH ABOUT WAGES.—A few days ago a distinguished United States Senator is reported to have said: "There has never been a day when a day's labor would buy so many of the necessaries and the luxuries of life as a day's labor will buy to-day." There is truth in this utterance, and the Boston *Advertiser* pointedly suggests that those who are trying to foment discontent, and proclaiming that the present times are the worst times, would do well to think upon it. There have been times when the wages of labor were higher, but they were times when everything which was bought with the wages was higher too. Low as wages are, the improvement of business that has come leaves very few idle who are willing to work, and all who will work can get to-day a better living for their wages than ever before, better than during the flush times of the war or the period after the war. The poor man who will work has as good a chance now to get ahead and become a capitalist as the poor man ever had.

THE purchasing power of farm products is now nearly double what it was before the war, and considerably greater than it was during the flush times of 1873. Whatever the farmer has to buy he buys at lower prices than ever before prevailed in our country; while the prices of everything that he has to sell remain satisfactory.

3 0112 062199994